

REMARKS

Claims 4-6 and 14 are pending in this application. Claim 4 has been amended. Claims 1-3, 7-13, and 15-18 were previously canceled. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications. In view of the amendments to claim 4 and the remarks below, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Claim 4 stands objected to because of informalities. Line 2 of claim 4 has been amended to recite “performing initial print setup in the computer,” as suggested by the Examiner. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0046682 to Crespo et al. (“Crespo”) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0083131 to Machida (“Machida”). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 4 describes a software installing method for installing a plurality of items of software on a computer. The claim 4 method includes “acquiring a template . . . the template including one or more parameters representing incomplete information.” Claim 4 also includes “reading the template to determine whether the template contains parameters representing incomplete information, and subsequently acquiring print setting information corresponding to the one or more parameters by searching an installation database.” Importantly, “said searching is processed by said computer,” the computer being the one receiving the software installation. Also “the installation database [is] located outside said computer.” According to the claim 4 method, a plurality of items of software are installed on a computer by executing an installation after saving a template of a scenario and an installation program on the computer to which the software is to be installed. The print setting information suitable for the computer is retrieved from the installation database by the computer receiving the installation, and the scenario suitable for the computer is applied to the installation program, which reduces the amount of parameter input necessary for the installation.

Crespo does not teach or suggest “installing a plurality of items of software in a computer” by searching an installation database for print setting information “said searching [being] processed by said computer” on which the installation is being performed. In Crespo, a SRC file is searched for by an SDCONF process that is stored on and executed by a SD server. Crespo at [0109], [0117]. The creation of a scenario is not performed on the computer to which software is installed. Specifically, Crespo describes that files are prepared on the server, and “once all the files are ready in the SD servers (108) for the complete installation of the target machine (112), the target machine (112) is booted, connected to the server, partitioned, formatted, and then finally installed.” Crespo at [0111]. Since the searching is not performed by the computer on which the installation is being performed, Crespo requires that a user must input a “Machine name,” a “SD server name,” a “hardware model,” etc., into the SRC file prior to the installation. Crespo at [0084]

The Office Action, at page 4, admits that Crespo does not teach or suggest the installation database search being processed by the computer where the installation is performed. The Office Action relies upon Machida to teach this element, stating that “it would have been obvious at the time of the invention to have installed Machida’s acquired print setup information using Crespo’s method.” This, however, would be impossible. As described above, the computers in Crespo are not operable prior to the configuration of the installation files: they are not connected to the server, partitioned or formatted. Crespo at [0111]. The computers in Crespo would be in no state to search an installation database. Since the computers to be installed in Crespo are in an essentially non-functional state, there would be no way to perform Machida’s alleged searching. Even if the computers were booted using a CID application, there would be no apparent way for the computers to perform the printer file configuration. The computers in Crespo do not receive anything that could be considered the template file of claim 4, so they could not read the template and acquire print setting information to be input into the template. Moving this process to the computers would require a complete reconfiguration of Crespo’s system, including moving the functions on the SD server onto each individual computer.

Moreover, even if such a combination could be achieved, using the computers to build the template is directly contrary to Crespo’s objectives. Crespo teaches away from such a

combination when it states that “[i]t is another object of the present invention to build the operating system and any required product or application according to a machine profiling mechanism controlled by a central repository.” To distribute the profiling mechanism to the computers would be antithetical to this objective. Thus, Machida’s combination could not, and would not be combined with Machida’s alleged searching at the installation computer.

Machida does not teach or suggest all elements of claim 4, and the Office Action does not contend otherwise. In the “Allowable Subject Matter” section of the Office Action dated December 9, 2008, the Examiner indicated that at least the elements of former claim 5 (now incorporated into claim 4) are not taught or suggested by Machida. These elements include: acquiring a template of a scenario, reading the template to determine whether the template contains incomplete information, subsequently acquiring print setting information by searching an installation database, producing the scenario which is specific to said computer, inputting the produced scenario to an installation program, and installing the installation program into the computer. In the pending Office Action, Machida is relied upon merely to teach the feature of searching an installation database for print setting information from the computer receiving the installation. The other elements of claim 4 are not taught or suggested by Machida, and as discussed above, even if Machida does teach searching an installation database from the computer receiving the installation, the Machida reference can not be combined with Crespo.

For at least these reasons, Crespo and Machida, even when considered together, do not teach or suggest the claim 4 method. Claim 4 is therefore allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 6 and 14 both recite “said searching is processed by said computer” and are therefore allowable for similar reasons that claim 4 is allowable, and for other reasons.

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance. If there are any additional charges in connection with this filing or any subsequent filings (including but not limited to issue fees), the Examiner is respectfully requested and authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1073 therefor under Order No. R2184.0239/P239.

Dated: September 9, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By  _____

Mark J. Thronson

Registration No.: 33,082

Jonathan L. Falkler

Registration No.: 62,115

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicant